



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,049	09/18/2008	C. Garrison Fathman	STAN-324 (S02-289)	6316
77974	7590	07/06/2010	EXAMINER	
Stanford University Office of Technology Licensing Bozicevic, Field & Francis LLP 1900 University Avenue Suite 200 East Palo Alto, CA 94303			SCHULTZ, JAMES	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1633		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		07/06/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/579,049	FATHMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JD SCHULTZ, PhD	1633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19, 22 and 23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-19, 22 and 23 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group 1, claim(s) 1, and 4-6, drawn to a method for identifying an agent that increases the activity of the GRAIL complex in a cell. Election of this group requires a further election of A) a complex comprising GRAIL, B) a cell comprising a complex comprising GRAIL, C) a nonhuman animal model comprising cells expressing exogenous GRAIL. This is a species election.

Group 2, claim(s) 1-3 and 6, drawn to a method for identifying an agent that decreases activity of the GRAIL complex in a cell. Election of this group requires a further election of A) a complex comprising GRAIL, B) a cell comprising a complex comprising GRAIL, C) a nonhuman animal model comprising cells expressing exogenous GRAIL. This is a species election.

Group 3, claim(s) 7-11, drawn to a method of determining the substrates of an E3 ligase.

Group 4, claim(s) 12, an animal model for investigating the biological function of the GRAIL complex.

Group 5, claim(s) 13-19, drawn to a method of treating a proliferative disorder. Election of this group requires a further election of A) wherein said proliferative disorder is cancer, or B) wherein the proliferative disorder is lupus erythematosus. Election of this group also requires a further election of wherein the agent increases ubiquitination of GRAIL, or ras GFR-1 by GRAIL. These are species elections.

Group 6, claim(s) 22, drawn to an isolated polypeptide complex comprising GRAIL and one or more of an otubain isoform; USP8 and ras-GRF1.

Group 7, claim(s) 23, drawn to a method of diagnosing a defect in immune tolerance or cellular proliferation, comprising determining the steady state level of GRAIL polypeptide or an otubain isoform polypeptide.

The inventions listed as Groups 1-7 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the technical feature shared amongst the groups is not a contribution over the prior art. Specifically, the technical feature shared by the instant groups is the polypeptide GRAIL, which is known in the art. See Anandasabapathy (Immunity, April 2003. 18:535-547, of record, applicants IDS), who teaches the polypeptide GRAIL. Accordingly, since the shared technical feature (i.e. GRAIL) is not a contribution over the prior art, and since by definition the shared technical feature must form a contribution over the prior art in order for the technical feature to be considered "special", the groups do not have the same or corresponding special technical features. See M.P.E.P. 1850.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

In groups 1 and 2, A) a complex comprising GRAIL, B) a cell comprising a nucleic acid and encoding and expressing an exogenous complex comprising GRAIL, C) a nonhuman animal model comprising cells expressing exogenous GRAIL. For group 1, Claims 1 and 4-6 encompass the subject matter, and are generic. For group 2, Claims 1-3 and 6 encompass the subject matter, and are generic.

In Group 5, the species wherein said proliferative disorder is cancer (encompassed by claims 13, 14, and 17-19), or wherein the proliferative disorder is lupus erythematosus (encompassed by claims 13, and 15-19). Claims 13 and 17-19 are generic. Also in group 5, the species wherein a method comprising the agent that increases ubiquitination of GRAIL (encompassed by claims 13-18), or ras GFR-1 by GRAIL (encompassed by claims 13-17 and 19). Claims 13-17 are generic.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JD SCHULTZ, PhD whose telephone number is (571)272-0763. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach can be reached on 571-272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JD SCHULTZ, PhD/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633